

OUTLOOK

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER FOR FACULTY AND STAFF AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

MAY 13, 1992
VOLUME 6, NUMBER 30

"Moving Beyond Hard Choices," President William E. Kirwan's Remarks to the Campus Senate, May 4, 1992

I appreciate having this opportunity to address the Senate. Given what the institution has been through over the past two years, we need to continue to talk and to think—together—about where we stand as an institution and about what we can plan for in the days and years to come.

I want to begin by commending the Senate for the manner in which it dealt with the APAC recommendations. While other universities have tried to take such initiatives, very few have succeeded in carrying the process through to a conclusion—especially in as open and consultative a manner as occurred on this campus. As a community, I believe we can take considerable pride in this accomplishment.

I have endorsed all of the Senate's APAC recommendations and have forwarded them to the Board of Regents for its consideration. I anticipate that the Board will take action on this matter at its June 5, 1992, meeting.

As a consequence of the decisions that have been reached, the campus will be able to transfer badly needed resources, ultimately \$6 million, to higher priority areas. Moreover, I feel confident we have strengthened our case for additional State appropriations in the future.

With this major restructuring effort now completed, it is essential that we return to our primary task—the continuing development of College Park as one of the nation's preeminent public universities.

Good News from Annapolis

As we look to next year and beyond, a central question is the degree of state support we can anticipate. To begin a discussion of this issue, I want to review this year's budget process in Annapolis. There is some good news to report.

A portion of our cuts, though a relatively small one, has been restored. Our General Fund support has been increased from its present level of approximately \$198 million to a little over \$212 million. Total support—

General Fund, tuition, and other revenues—for our state-funded programs has risen from its FY 1992 low point of \$314.8 million to a projected \$332 million for FY 1993. That's a \$17.2 million gain.

Most of this increase is targeted for mandated expenses: \$4 million for academic revenue bonds to support the construction of the Plant Sciences and Space Sciences buildings; \$3.2 million for increased costs of employee health insurance; \$2.7 million for maintenance, equipment, and utilities associated with new facilities coming on line, facilities such as the new business school and the renovated McKeldin Library; \$1.6 million for the tuition remission program; and about \$400,000 for increased student financial aid.

After all of these mandatory expenses are covered, we are left with \$5.3 million plus \$2 million of funds freed up from one-time mandatory expenditures in FY 1992. Thus, we have just \$7.3 million to address the wounds of our past budget cuts. This \$7.3 million will be allocated as follows:

1. \$2 million to reduce the \$17.5% tuition surcharge to 15%. Although the actual decrease in tuition is small, we hope this commitment signals an era of more moderate tuition increases.

2. \$300,000 to support projected reclassifications of classified staff in FY 1993. Given the shortage of funds in the units, this \$300,000 will be a resource to be allocated in support of those reclassifications that are approved through our current process. The \$300,000 total is approximately the cost of reclassifications in past years.

3. Approximately \$900,000 will be allocated to units in Administrative Affairs, Student Affairs, Institutional Advancement and offices reporting to the President's Office. These funds will be used to address some of the most severe service reductions in our support units.

4. The remaining \$4.1 million will be allocated to the colleges and other units in Academic Affairs. Dr. Goldhaber has consulted with APAC and the Council of Deans on the distribu-

tion of these funds. With his agreement, I will share with you the allocations:

- \$1.6 million to address the most pressing needs in research and instruction programs of the colleges and academic departments;
- \$750,000 to begin rebuilding our Library;
- \$350,000 to augment retention funds in our departments and colleges;
- \$700,000 for graduate student step raises;
- \$300,000 for teaching and research equipment;
- \$225,000 for academic support units; and
- \$140,000 for outreach programs.

These allocations are at best a band-aid at a time when we are in need of a transfusion. In my view, the biggest disappointment in the State's FY 1993 budget is the absence of general COLA and merit funds. We now face another year without raises. Indeed, because of the furloughs, most of us experienced an actual salary decline in 1991-92.

For FY 1994, substantial COLA and merit increases will be the campus' number one priority. We are at work collecting data to document our decline in salaries in comparison to salaries of faculty and staff at peer institutions.

Despite the disappointments in the total allocation, I think there is a sense in which this legislative session was both important and successful for the campus.

For the first time, to my knowledge,



President William E. Kirwan

SPECIAL ISSUE

GENERAL FUND HISTORY : COLLEGE PARK

FISCAL YEAR	UMCP GENERAL FUNDS	% CHANGE OVER PRIOR YEAR	% CHANGE OVER FY 1983
1983	84,496,618		
1984	86,007,903	1.8%	1.8%
1985	123,532,699	43.6%	46.2%
1986	137,282,566	11.1%	62.5%
1987	149,609,743	9.0%	77.1%
1988	165,328,054	10.5%	95.7%
1989	191,988,090	10.5%	127.2%
1990	224,850,223	17.1%	166.1%
1991	221,554,862	-1.5%	162.2%
1992	199,584,520	-9.9%	136.2%
1993	212,616,820	6.5%	151.6%

the General Assembly singled out the College Park campus for special budgetary consideration. It spared College Park, and the College Park campus alone, an additional \$2.3 million in cuts from the Governor's recommended budget.

Moreover, when the General Assembly decided to remove the restriction on the Governor's allocation of funds to eliminate the tuition surcharge, they put College Park's full surcharge reduction allocation in our General Fund but cut half the corresponding allocation at all other institutions in the System.

Without these actions, we would not be in a position to allocate the \$7.3 million that I just discussed. By their deeds, the General Assembly—and most especially the members of the 21st District delegation—sent a very clear signal about the priority for College Park.

There is another sense in which this legislative session was a success. Through the efforts of many people on this campus—students, faculty and staff—we built a powerful coalition of alumni and friends who rallied to our cause.

Such advocacy for College Park is not something we should take lightly; we have not always had it. It strengthens our position enormously because it adds credibility to the claims we have been making on our own behalf: that we are a quality institution; that our graduates are assuming positions of importance in the business world, in the arts, education, and the scientific communities; and that we are an asset of great importance for the state and region.

For at least a century, while providing its citizens with public universities of broad access, the state of Maryland has chosen to focus its resources on creating private universities of excellence. Until recently it was not even assumed that College Park had a significant role to play in promoting the long-term well-being of the state.

The 1988 Higher Education Act changed all that, and it is much too important a change to forget about only four years later. We have a responsibility not merely to ourselves and our students, not merely to our disciplines and professions, but also to the citizens of Maryland to continue to work to build the distinguished public university the state needs and College Park can become. We have now an impressive array of legislative, private sector, and alumni support to draw upon as we build our

case for increased support in FY 1994 and future years.

So where do we go from here?

I am, as many of you have noticed, an eternal, indefatigable optimist. So I will quote an unbiased source. Two weeks ago an article in the *Boston Globe* reviewed how little progress had been made at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst since it became one of five campuses in the state's newly reorganized higher education system and now had to compete for a portion of a smaller pie of state funding. As I was reading along, one sentence jumped out at me, "U Mass-Amherst has not been able to approach the level of excellence of the great public universities of Michigan, California, and Maryland." Need we say or do any more? Perhaps we should just simply declare victory. But I don't think any of us would be satisfied with that.

In 1989, back before the budget cuts, many of us thought we were on the way to a higher level of excellence and, had we received the enhancement funding we proposed, I feel confident we would have reached the top echelon of the nation's public universities in a relatively short period of time. But the budget rescissions blocked our plans. And so I ask again, where do we go from here?

Our Enhancement Plan—developed in response to a specific charge by the Governor and General Assembly—defined excellence in terms of our departments achieving national rankings for their eminence in research and teaching; our research serving as a catalyst for the economic development of the state and region; our creation of a model academic workplace and a showplace for the fine and performing arts; and our development of so solid a reputation for quality that acceptance for admission to College Park would become a much sought-after mark of distinction.

In my opinion, the basic elements of our earlier vision of academic excellence remain completely valid for us today, even if the process of "getting to excellence" is much more difficult than we originally thought.

A Plan For The Future

In the reaccreditation report we are currently submitting to the Middle States Association, the review committee argues that if College Park is to continue to improve its present standing, it will need to focus its resources to a far greater degree on selected programs, and use its internal resources to leverage additional

external support to a far greater extent than it has in the past. I think this view is correct.

Next week the deans, the members of APAC, Acting Provost Jack Goldhaber and I will hold a day-long meeting to explore ways and means for taking a more focused approach to program enhancement and to identify some targets and strategies. As a prologue to this and other planning activities that will engage the campus over the coming months, I want to mention five areas that I think require special attention as we begin to make more directed commitments of resources.

These areas are: the creation of a dependable source of funds to support our best opportunities for research and graduate education excellence; the quality of our undergraduate program; the institution's

As I was reading a recent article in the *Boston Globe*, one sentence jumped out at me, "U Mass-Amherst has not been able to approach the level of excellence of the great public universities of Michigan, California, and Maryland." Need we say or do any more?

OUTLOOK

Outlook is the weekly faculty-staff newspaper serving the College Park campus community.

Kathryn Costello Vice President for Institutional Advancement

Tom Otwell Acting Editor
John Fritz Staff Writer
Lisa Gregory Staff Writer
Fariss Samarra Staff Writer
Gary Stephenson Staff Writer
Beth Workman Staff Writer
Laurie Gaines Calendar Editor

Judith Bair Director of Creative Services
John T. Consoli Format Designer
Stephen Darrou Layout & Illustration
Christopher Paul Layout & Production
Al Danegger Photography
Kerstin A. Neteler Production Intern

Letters to the editor, story suggestions, campus information & calendar items are welcome. Please submit all material at least three weeks before the Monday of publication. Send it to Editor Outlook, 2101 Turner Building, through campus mail or to University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742. Our telephone number is (301) 405-4621. Electronic mail address is outlook@pres.umd.edu. Fax number is (301) 314-9344.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

commitment to diversity; the sense of professionalism in our operations; and outreach to the state.

Research Support

We are currently paying a price for the serious imbalance in our funding sources. In the most recent year for which figures are available, FY 89, about 45% of our total budget consisted of state appropriations, the second highest percentage among all our peer institutions.

Don't misread this figure. It does not say we have the second highest level of state support. In fact, we are near the bottom in that category. It says that we do not have other sources of revenue to draw upon at the rate of many of our peers. For example, in the same year—FY 89—we ranked next to last among our peers in the percentage of the budget supplied from federal sources (16.2%—though some peers include medical school budgets in their reporting) and we ranked last overall in the percentage of the budget obtained from private contracts and grants, only 3.3%.

In other words, we are too dependent on state General Funds. When these funds are reduced, we do not have the cushion that many of our peers have.

As one step toward correcting this problem of funding imbalance and to provide a buffer against the vagaries of state funding, I believe we should undertake an initiative to stimulate increased research and graduate education activity in identified key fields. One way to proceed would be on a model provided by the University of Michigan.

I will recommend to the deans and members of APAC that we consider creating a Research Investment Program equal to one percent of our annual academic budgets for reallocation to our highest priority research projects and opportunities.

In years when the campus receives additional appropriations for its internal allocation, a portion of these funds might go to support this initiative, but in years when appropriated funds are not made available for this purpose, the one percent amount would be achieved by reallocation from our existing unit budgets.

The main objective of an initiative along these lines would be to insure that our best faculty are able to carry out the most promising lines of research, research with the potential to bring great distinction both to them and to their university. If wisely managed, this fund would also enable us to use our own resources to

leverage additional non-General Fund support from external sources such as foundations, corporations, federal and state agencies.

If the planning group and the Provost decide to move in this direction, they will need to prepare a set of guidelines for how particular areas of emphasis would be identified, how individuals, groups, or entire units would submit proposals for support, and how the success of individual projects would be evaluated. My role in the process, I assure you, would be initial and preliminary. I would like to see us undertake an effort such as this because I believe it could rekindle some of the creative energies that have been dampened during the last two years. But it is the task of APAC, the deans, and the Provost to pursue the idea as far as they think feasible and desirable.

Undergraduate Education

The second issue we must address is the overall quality of undergraduate education on the campus. Our aspirations for the institution—and quite frankly the public perceptions of our quality—are inextricably linked to the strength of our undergraduate programs. We now have a remarkably well thought-out undergraduate curriculum, and many of our units have improved their programs for majors. In a significant number of departments on the campus our students can receive, even after all the cuts, as fine an education as they could, truly and literally, anywhere else in the nation.

But there are two respects in which we still experience difficulties: graduation rates and the overall learning experience. Our five-year graduation rates, especially those of our Black undergraduate students, remain quite low—in the most recent class, only 55% of all freshmen and 35% of all Black freshmen graduate within five years' time. I want to see us address this problem along various lines: by increasing the numbers of exceptionally well-prepared students recruited to come to College Park, especially outstanding minority students; by increasing the number of enriched or special learning opportunities for our students once they are here—for example, by instituting many more opportunities for honors and research-related work in individual departments; and by improving significantly the advising we provide our students.

I will ask the Provost to work with the deans and others to develop a set of measurable goals for our under-

graduate program. These goals must set new—and much higher—expectations for the recruitment of talented students, for retention and graduation rates, and for our graduates' overall satisfaction with their experience at College Park.

Diversity

The third area that needs our attention is the institution's commitment to diversity. As an institution, we can take pride in the news we read in the May 4, 1992 *Washington Post*. College Park is now recognized as the national leader among non-historically Black institutions in the production of African-Americans with bachelor's degrees and we rank first among these institutions in the number of Blacks who have received a Ph.D. over the period from 1986 to 1990. The fact that we rank so high is both gratifying and a little surprising because I do not believe any of us feel satisfied with the actual number of Black graduates or with the retention rate of Black students.

In several recent campus studies, minority students, faculty and staff report that they are periodically exposed to racist sentiments expressed by others. So despite our relative achievements as a leader in the statistics of diversity, we have not yet reached the point where our minority students can pursue their education and our minority faculty and staff can pursue their careers in a completely positive and welcoming environment. How do we, as a community, react to incidents of bigotry and bias when they occur? Are we prepared to respond critically or does our silence speak volumes?

Moreover, one would expect that in a university, of all places, it would be possible to engage in free and unfettered discussion of vital questions. But we rarely engage one another in open discussion about issues related to race. So, clearly there is more we could do to create a climate in which all our students, faculty and staff feel that their presence is valued and welcomed. On June 30, I will receive a report from the Excellence Through Diversity Committee, a committee I appointed in consultation with the Campus Senate. I anticipate that the report, which I will share with the Senate, will contain far reaching recommendations on diversity issues

Let us resolve not just to be the leader in the statistics of diversity, let us be the leader in realizing the "potential of diversity." Let us be the institution that the nation turns to as both an example to be emulated and a resource to be utilized.

I believe it is time for us to discard our yoke of despair, rekindle our institutional ambitions, recapture our spirit of mutual trust, and return — in a focused determined way — to building the kind of institution that seemed within our grasp just a few short years ago.

and a plan for campus action.

In discussing the issue of diversity, I want to add that I know all of us have been shocked by the decision in the Rodney King case and both saddened and alarmed by the subsequent events. This episode has brought to the surface deep seated

and troubling racial divisions in our society. It seems to me that there is one of two divergent paths our nation can now follow. We can allow this incident to increase division, suspicion, mistrust and hostility or we can respond by admitting that fundamental problems exist, problems that can only be solved by people coming together in a spirit of determination and good will.

Obviously, we in this community must do everything we can to see that the latter course is followed. In this

vein, I believe there is a constructive role we can, and, I hope, will play.

Let us resolve not just to be the leader in the statistics of diversity, let us be the leader in realizing the "potential of diversity." Let us be the institution that the nation turns to as both an example to be emulated and a resource to be utilized.

I propose that we develop a major focus of research and educational activity on race and gender relations in America. We have extraordinary resources in academic units such as our School of Public Affairs, in our departments of Economics, Government and Politics, and Sociology, and in our programs of Afro-American Studies and Women's Studies. One idea that occurs to me is that we could draw upon these and other resources including the Colleges of Architecture, Business, Education, and Engineering, to develop a model for the American city in the 21st century. I am certain that other ideas will emerge. But, whatever ultimately becomes the focus for the initiative, I hope this campus, located in an urban area that includes our nation's capital, will take up the formidable challenge of helping our country develop a more rational, harmonious and productive social structure. This is an initiative I will charge the Provost to pursue with APAC, the deans and appropriate faculty.

Institutional Work Ethic

The fourth area that I believe needs attention is our institutional work habits. Clearly it has not been easy for any of us to remain upbeat in the face of the assaults on our paychecks and work schedules. As I mentioned earlier, I can promise you that the resumption of faculty and staff raises will be the number one priority in our FY 94 budget request. But not all the difficulties we face as a campus are a result of our fiscal problems. Although many of our offices and academic units operate at a high level of efficiency, I worry that instances of dysfunction are too high, that our students too often wind up without the services they need, and that our administrative operations are not responsive at a uniformly high level. As the head of an institution committed to excellence, I feel I have an obligation to set high standards and to undertake whatever measures may be needed to ensure they are being met. We are currently engaged in a survey of the users of our administrative services, and this will aid us in identifying particular problem areas.

As a step toward setting higher performance standards, I will, beginning with the new fiscal year, institute a more structured system of expectations and accountability for the Vice Presidents. I am also requesting that the Provost do the same for the deans. Furthermore, all future appointments of Vice Presidents, Deans, and Department Chairs will be subject to the recommendations of the Senate's Governance report. Namely, such appointments will be for terms not to exceed five years, with continuation to a second term subject to a full review and positive recommendation for continuance. Moreover, in keeping with recommendations in the Governance Report, I will oversee the implementation of a periodic review of existing Vice Presidents and Deans and I will ask the Board of Regents to conduct a review of my performance, with campus input, prior to the fifth anniversary of my appointment as president.

A commitment to high standards of performance, if it is to spread throughout the institution, has to apply to everybody. I would welcome your suggestions for measures you think might help us to strengthen our sense of professionalism and the commitment to the quality each of us brings to our daily work.

Service to the State

Finally, as we work to improve our internal operations, I think we need also to become more aware of the importance of our external constituency, persons and institutions located elsewhere in the state and region who seek us out for assistance. I concede that we cannot do everything for everybody, especially with fewer dollars to work with than we used to have, but I have to say that, at present, we do not have an image of responsiveness that befits our role as the state's flagship institution. We need to be working more closely with K through 12 educators, expanding our technology transfer and economic development programs, as well as our interactive programs with state offices and agencies. To ignore these opportunities for service is almost literally to bite the hand that feeds us. As I mentioned earlier, we have set aside a modest pool of funds in FY 1993 to encourage new and to support better existing outreach activities.

So these are areas where I would like to see us focus more of our attention: marshalling a pool of reliable resources in support of our most promising research and graduate education initiatives; renewing attention to our undergraduate program and to the learning environment for our students; bringing our intellectual resources to bear on issues of racism and bigotry in our society and on our campus; and making the resources of the institution more readily available to the citizens of Maryland.

This is an ambitious agenda. Given our current resource constraints, I recognize that we will have to approach it in phases. But I believe it is time for us to discard our yoke of despair, rekindle our institutional ambitions, recapture our spirit of mutual trust, and return—in a focused determined way—to building the kind of institution that seemed within our grasp just a few short years ago, the kind of institution we can still create here at College Park.